arXiv:1207.1989v1 [math.AP] 9 Jul 2012

Locked solutions of coupled Gross-Pitaevskii equations

Thomas Bartsch

Dedicated to Professor Kasimierz Gęba.

Abstract

We consider the system

$$-\Delta u_j + a(x)u_j = \mu_j u_j^3 + \beta \sum_{k\neq j} u_k^2 u_j,\ u_j > 0, \qquad j = 1,\dots,n,$$

on a possibly unbounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N \le 3$, with Dirichlet boundary conditions. The system appears in nonlinear optics and in the analysis of mixtures of Bose-Einstein condensates. Two components u_i, u_j are said to be locked if u_i/u_j is constant. The main results are concerned with the bifurcation of solutions $(u_1,\dots,u_n)$ where some components are locked from a branch where all solutions are locked. The bifurcation parameter is β.

Key words: system of nonlinear Schrödinger equations, coupled Gross-Pitaevskii equations, solitary waves, repulsive interaction, global bifurcation

AMS subject classification: 35B05, 35B32, 35J50, 35J55, 58C40, 58E07

1 Introduction

The system of coupled Gross-Pitaevskii equations

$$(1.1)\qquad -i\partial_t \psi_j(x,t) = \Delta_x \psi_j + \mu_j |\psi_j|^2 \psi_j + \beta \sum_{k\neq j} |\psi_k|^2 \psi_j \qquad j = 1,\dots,n,$$

in $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N \le 3$, with parameters $\mu_1,\dots,\mu_n > 0$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, has found considerable interest in the last years. It appears in nonlinear optics and in models for mixtures of

Bose-Einstein condensates; see [1, 7, 15] for physics, and [2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 14, 17, 18] for mathematics papers. We deal with the case of attractive self-interaction, i. e. $\mu_i > 0$, and repelling interaction between different components, i. e. $\beta < 0$. The ansatz

$$\psi_j(x,t) = e^{it}u_j(x), \qquad j = 1,\dots,n,$$

for stationary waves leads to the following elliptic system for the amplitudes $u_1,\dots,u_n$:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_j + u_j = \mu_j u_j^3 + \beta \displaystyle\sum_{k\neq j} u_k^2 u_j, \\ u_j \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N),\ u_j > 0, \end{cases} \qquad j = 1,\dots,n. \tag{1.2}$$

We keep $\mu_1,\dots,\mu_n > 0$ fixed and take β as bifurcation parameter.

Most of the above mentioned papers papers deal with the case $n = 2$ of two components. Using variational methods, the existence of ground and bound states is obtained. In [4] a different approach is pursued using bifurcation methods, but only for $n = 2$. We shall extend this bifurcation approach from $n = 2$ to arbitrary $n \geq 2$. This leads to interesting new features and difficulties. For instance, in the radial setting of [4] the linearizations have a one-dimensional kernel at the bifurcation parameter. This allows to use degree theory to prove global bifurcation of solutions. For more than two equations we have to deal with high-dimensional kernels forced by the structure of the system. We shall partially explain this with a hidden symmetry of the problem which will lead to multiple global bifurcation branches.

Actually, we shall deal with a more general problem. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N \leq 3$, be a domain which is invariant under a closed subgroup $G \subset O(N)$, and suppose $a \in L^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$ is invariant under G. We require that $-\Delta + a$ is a positive self-adjoint operator on $L^2(\Omega)$, and define

$$E := \left\{ u \in H_0^1(\Omega) : u \text{ is } G\text{-invariant}, \textstyle\int_\Omega a u^2 < \infty \right\}.$$

The norm in E is given by

$$\|u\|_E^2 = \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 + \int_\Omega a u^2.$$

We also require that the embedding $E \hookrightarrow L^4(\Omega)$ is compact. This is the case, for instance, if Ω is bounded and G is trivial, or if Ω is radially symmetric and $G = O(N)$, $2 \leq N \leq 3$. It is also the case if $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$ and $a(x) \to \infty$ as $|x| \to \infty$.

The problem we investigate is

$$(1.3)\qquad \begin{cases} -\Delta u_j + a(x)u_j = \mu_j u_j^3 + \beta \sum\limits_{k\neq j} u_k^2 u_j\ , & j = 1,\dots,n,\\ u_j \in E,\ u_j > 0. \end{cases}$$

As mentioned above, this covers the important special case $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$, $N = 2$ or $N = 3$, $E = H^1_{rad}(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

A solution $(u_1,\dots,u_n)$ of (1.3) is said to be locked if u_i/u_j is constant for all i, j. In this paper we first describe the set of locked solutions of (1.3). We then investigate the bifurcation of non-locked solutions from the set of locked solutions. In particular, we shall prove the bifurcation of partially locked solutions where u_i/u_j is constant for some $i \neq j$, but not for all indices.

Without loss of generality we assume $0 < \mu_1 \le \mu_2 \le \dots \le \mu_n$ throughout the paper.

2 Branches of locked solutions

Given a solution of the scalar equation

$$(2.1)\qquad \begin{cases} -\Delta w + a(x)w = w^3\\ w \in E, w > 0 \end{cases}$$

there exists a branch $\mathcal{T}_w \subset \mathbb{R} \times E^n$ of locked solutions $(\beta, u_1,\dots,u_n)$ of (1.3) such that each u_i is a multiple of w. In order to describe this branch we set

$$(2.2)\qquad g(\beta) := 1 + \beta \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\mu_k - \beta}$$

and for $j = 1,\dots,n$:

$$(2.3)\qquad \alpha_j(\beta) := \big((\mu_j - \beta)g(\beta)\big)^{-1/2}$$

Observe that g is defined and strictly increasing in the interval $(-\infty, \mu_1)$, and that it satisfies $g(0) = 1$, $g(\beta) \to 1 - n < 0$ as $\beta \to -\infty$. Thus there exists a unique $\overline{\beta} = \overline{\beta}(\mu_1,\dots,\mu_n) < 0$ such that $g(\overline{\beta}) = 0$. Consequently, the functions $\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_n$ are defined for $\beta \in (\overline{\beta}, \mu_1) \cup (\mu_n, \infty)$.

Proposition 2.1. *Problem* (1.3) *has a locked solution* $(\beta, u_1,\dots,u_n)$ *precisely in the following cases:*

(i) $\beta \in (\overline{\beta}, \mu_1) \cup (\mu_n, \infty)$*: Then* $u_j = \alpha_j(\beta)w, j = 1, \ldots, n$*, for some solution* w *of* (2.1).

(ii) $\beta = \mu_1 = \ldots = \mu_n$*: Then* $u_j = \alpha_j w$*,* $j = 1, \ldots, n$ *for some solution* w *of* (2.1)*,* $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n > 0$*,* $\alpha_1^2 + \ldots + \alpha_n^2 = 1/\beta$*.*

Proof. If $(\beta, u_1, \ldots, u_n)$ is a locked solution then u_1 solves $-\Delta u_1 + a(x)u_1 = cu_1^3$ for some constant $c > 0$. It follows that $w = c^{1/2}u_1$ solves (2.1), and all u_j's are multiples of w.

Now write $u_j = \alpha_j w$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, where w is a solution of (2.1). Then (1.3) leads to

$$\alpha_j w^3 = (-\Delta + a(x))\alpha_j w = \left(\mu_j \alpha_j^3 + \beta \sum_{k \neq j} \alpha_k^2 \alpha_j \right) w^3$$

hence,

$$\mu_j \alpha_j^2 + \beta \sum_{k \neq j} \alpha_k^2 = 1, \quad j = 1, \ldots, n. \tag{2.4}$$

This implies

$$(\mu_i - \beta)\alpha_i^2 = (\mu_j - \beta)\alpha_j^2 \quad \text{for all } i, j. \tag{2.5}$$

In case (i) it follows from (2.5) that $\alpha_j = \left(\frac{\mu_1 - \beta}{\mu_j - \beta}\right)^{1/2} \alpha_1$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$. A simple computation using (2.4) now yields

$$\alpha_1 = \big((\mu_1 - \beta)g(\beta)\big)^{-1/2} = \alpha_1(\beta),$$

and $\alpha_j = \alpha_j(\beta)$ for all j follows immediately. This proves in case (i) that a locked solution $(\beta, u_1, \ldots, u_n)$ necessarily has the form $u_j = \alpha_j(\beta)w$ for some solution w of (2.1). If (i) does not apply then we must have $\beta = \mu_1 = \ldots = \mu_n$, which implies $\beta(\alpha_1^2 + \ldots + \alpha_n^2) = 1$, again by (2.4). This is as claimed in (ii).

Finally, an elementary calculation shows that $(\beta, u_1, \ldots, u_n)$ as described in (i) or (ii) is a solution of (1.3). $\square$

Now we fix a solution w of (2.1) and set

$$u(\beta) := (\alpha_1(\beta)w, \ldots, \alpha_n(\beta)w) \text{ for } \beta \in (\overline{\beta}, \mu_1) \cup (\mu_n, \infty).$$

We want to investigate the bifurcation of solutions of (1.3) from

$$\mathcal{T}_w := \big\{ (\beta, u(\beta)) : \beta \in (\overline{\beta}, \mu_1) \cup (\mu_n, \infty) \big\}.$$

3 Necessary conditions for bifurcation

We need to linearize (1.3) at $(\beta, u(\beta)) \in \mathcal{T}_w$. A simple calculation leads to the system

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta + a(x))\phi = w^2 C(\beta)\phi \\ \phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)^\top \in E^n \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

with

$$C(\beta) = E_n + \frac{2}{g(\beta)} D(\beta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}.$$

Here E_n is the $n \times n$ unit matrix and

$$D(\beta) = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1\gamma_1^2 & \beta\gamma_1\gamma_2 & \dots & \beta\gamma_1\gamma_n \\ \beta\gamma_1\gamma_2 & \mu_2\gamma_2^2 & \dots & \beta\gamma_2\gamma_n \\ \dots & \dots & & \dots \\ \beta\gamma_1\gamma_n & \beta\gamma_2\gamma_n & \dots & \mu_n\gamma_n^2. \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\gamma_j = \gamma_j(\beta) := (\mu_j - \beta)^{-1/2}$. Hence, $D(\beta) = (d_{ij}(\beta))_{i,j=1,\dots,n}$ with

$$d_{ij}(\beta) = \begin{cases} \beta\gamma_i(\beta)\gamma_j(\beta) = \dfrac{\beta}{\big((\mu_i - \beta)(\mu_j - \beta)\big)^{1/2}} & \text{if } i \neq j; \\ \mu_i\gamma_i(\beta)^2 = \dfrac{\mu_i}{\mu_i - \beta} & \text{if } i = j. \end{cases}$$

Observe that $C(\beta)$ and $D(\beta)$ are symmetric matrices.

Lemma 3.1. a) *$C(\beta)$ has the eigenvalues* 3 *and*

$$f(\beta) := 1 + \frac{2}{g(\beta)} = 1 + \frac{2}{1 + \beta\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{\mu_k - \beta}}.$$

b) *If $\beta \neq 0$ then the eigenvalue* 3 *is simple with eigenvector*

$$b_1(\beta) = (\gamma_1(\beta), \dots, \gamma_n(\beta))^\top = \big((\mu_1 - \beta)^{-1/2}, \dots, (\mu_n - \beta)^{-1/2}\big)^\top, \tag{3.2}$$

and the eigenvalue $f(\beta)$ has multiplicity $n-1$ with eigenspace $b_1(\beta)^\perp$. If $\beta = 0$ then $f(0) = 3$ and $C(0) = 3E_n$.

Proof. A simple calculation shows that $D(\beta)b_1(\beta) = g(\beta)b_1(\beta)$, hence $C(\beta)b_1(\beta) = 3b_1(\beta)$. Moreover, setting

$$b_j(\beta) = (b_{j1}, \dots, b_{jn})^\top \quad \text{where } b_{jk} = \begin{cases} \gamma_j(\beta) & \text{if } k = 1, \\ -\gamma_1(\beta) & \text{if } k = j, \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

for $j = 2, \dots, n$ we have $b_j(\beta) \perp b_1(\beta)$ and $D(\beta)b_j(\beta) = b_j(\beta)$. This implies $C(\beta)b_j(\beta) = f(\beta)b_j(\beta)$ for $j = 2, \dots, n$.

Since $f(\beta) \neq 3$ for $\beta \neq 0$ we see that $C(\beta)$ has the eigenvalue $f(\beta)$ with eigenspace $\operatorname{span}\{b_2, \dots, b_n\} = b_1(\beta)^\perp$. If $\beta = 0$ then $f(0) = 3$, hence 3 is the only eigenvalue of the symmetric matrix $C(0)$. ☐

Remark 3.2. *Observe that* $f : (\overline{\beta}, \mu_1) \to (1, \infty)$ *is a strictly decreasing diffeomorphism. In fact,*

$$f'(\beta) = \frac{-2g'(\beta)}{g(\beta)^2} < 0 \quad \text{for } \overline{\beta} < \beta < \mu_1.$$

Moreover, $f(\beta) \to 1$ *as* $\beta \nearrow \mu_1$, *and* $f(\beta) \to \infty$ *as* $\beta \searrow \overline{\beta}$.

Remark 3.3. *Since* $C(\beta)$ *is a symmetric matrix depending smoothly on* β, *and since the eigenvector* $b_1(\beta)$ *also depends smoothly on* β, *there exists a smooth map* $T : (\overline{\beta}, \mu_1) \to SO(n)$ *such that*

$$T(\beta)^{-1}C(\beta)T(\beta) = \operatorname{diag}(3, f(\beta), \dots, f(\beta)).$$

A point $(\beta, u(\beta)) \in \mathcal{T}_w$ can be a bifurcation point of solutions of (1.3) only if (3.1) has a nontrivial solution ϕ. Nontrivial solutions of (3.1) are closely related to the weighted eigenvalue problem

$$-\Delta\psi + a(x)\psi = \lambda w^2 \psi, \quad \psi \in E. \tag{3.4}$$

Remark 3.4. *Recall that* w *is a non-degenerate solution of* (2.1) *if and only if* $\lambda = 3$ *is not an eigenvalue of* (3.4). *In the degenerate case where* $\psi \neq 0$ *is a solution of* (3.4) *with* $\lambda = 3$, *we see that* $\phi = b_1(\beta)\psi \in E^n$, $b_1(\beta) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ *as in* (3.2), *is a solution* (3.1) *for every* $\overline{\beta} < \beta < \mu_1$. *If* w *is not an isolated solution of* (2.1), *say* $w_k \to w$ *for a sequence of solutions of* (2.1), *then we have branches* $\mathcal{T}_{w_k}$ *of solutions of* (1.3). *In this case every point on* $\mathcal{T}_w$ *is a bifurcation point for* (1.3). *The problem is more subtle if* w *is an isolated, degenerate solution of* (2.1). *This case will not be treated here.*

From now on we assume that w is a non-degenerate solution of (2.1). Then (3.4) has a sequence of eigenvalues $\lambda_1 = 1 < \lambda_2 < \lambda_3 < \dots$ such that $\lambda_k \neq 3$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda_k \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$. The multiplicity of λ_k as eigenvalue of (3.4) is denoted by

$$n_k = \dim V_k \quad \text{with } V_k = \operatorname{kern}(-\Delta + a - \lambda_k w^2). \tag{3.5}$$

Proposition 3.5. a) *A point $(\beta, u(\beta)) \in \mathcal{T}_w$ is a bifurcation point only if $\beta = \beta_k := f^{-1}(\lambda_k)$ for some $k \geq 2$ with f from Lemma 3.1.*

b) *If $\beta = \beta_k$ then $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n) \in E^n$ solves* (3.1) *if, and only if, $\phi_j \in V_k$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$, and $\phi \perp b_1(\beta)$ with $b_1(\beta) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ from* (3.2)*, that is, $\sum_{j=1}^n \gamma_j(\beta)\phi_j = 0$. In particular, the space of solutions of* (3.1) *has dimension $(n-1) \cdot n_k$.*

Proof. a) Let $T(\beta) \in SO(n)$ be as in Remark 3.3. Then ϕ solves (3.1) if, and only if, $\psi = T(\beta)^{-1}\phi$ solves

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\psi_1 + a\psi_1 = 3w^2\psi_1 \\ -\Delta\psi_j + a\psi_j = f(\beta)w^2\psi_j, \quad j = 2, \dots, n. \end{cases} \tag{3.6}$$

Since w is non-degenerate this implies $\psi_1 = 0$, hence a nontrivial solution ψ exists, if and only if $f(\beta) = \lambda_k$ for some $k \geq 2$. (The case $k = 1$, i. e. $\lambda_1 = 1$, $\beta = \mu_1$ does not apply; see also Remark 3.6.) If $f(\beta) = \lambda_k$ then $\psi = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n)^\top$ with $\psi_1 = 0$, $\psi_2, \dots, \psi_n \in V_k$, solves (3.6).

b) We fix $\beta = f^{-1}(\lambda_k)$ and write $T = T(\beta) = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$. The transformations $\psi \mapsto T\psi$, $\phi \mapsto T^{-1}\phi$, are isomorphisms between the solutions of (3.6) and (3.1). As a consequence of Lemma 3.1 we see that T_1 is a multiple of $b_1(\beta)$, and $\operatorname{span}\{T_2, \dots, T_n\} = b_1(\beta)^\perp$. Thus ϕ solves (3.1) if, and only if, $\psi = T^{-1}\phi = T^\top\phi$ solves

$$\langle T_1, \phi\rangle = \psi_1 = 0, \text{ hence } 0 = \langle b_1(\beta), \phi\rangle = \gamma_1(\beta)\phi_1 + \dots + \gamma_n(\beta)\phi_n \tag{3.7}$$

and

$$\langle T_j, \phi\rangle = \psi_j \in V_k, \text{ for } j = 2, \dots, n. \tag{3.8}$$

Recall that the eigenvectors $b_2, \dots, b_n$ from (3.3) satisfy $\operatorname{span}\{b_2, \dots, b_n\} = \operatorname{span}\{T_2, \dots, T_n\}$. It follows that (3.8) is equivalent to

$$\langle b_j, \phi\rangle = \gamma_j(\beta)\phi_1 - \gamma_1(\beta)\phi_j \in V_k \quad \text{for } j = 2, \dots, n. \tag{3.9}$$

Now (3.7) and (3.9) are equivalent to

$$\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n \in V_k \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{n} \gamma_j(\beta)\phi_j = 0.$$

$\square$

Remark 3.6. *By our definition $\mathcal{T}_w$ does not contain a point with the parameter value $\beta = \mu_1$. If $\mu_1 < \mu_n$ then it is not difficult to show that $(\mu_1, u_1, \dots, u_n) \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_w$ implies that at least one $u_j = 0$. If $\mu_1 = \mu_n$ then $(\mu_1, (n\mu_1)^{-1/2}w, \dots, (n\mu_1)^{-1/2}w) \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_w$. This is a bifurcation point where the bifurcating locked solutions are described in Proposition 2.1:*

$$(\mu_1, \alpha_1 w, \dots, \alpha_n w) \text{ with } \alpha_j > 0, \quad \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_j^2 = 1/\beta = 1/\mu_1.$$

4 Sufficient conditions for bifurcation

We first recall the variational structure of problem (1.3). Since $N \leq 3$ the functional

$$\begin{aligned} J_\beta(u_1, \dots, u_n) & \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \int_\Omega (|\nabla u^j|^2 + a(x)u_j^2) - \frac{1}{4}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \int_\Omega \mu_j u_j^4 - \frac{\beta}{2}\sum_{i<j} \int_\Omega u_i^2 u_j^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|u_j\|_E^2 - \frac{1}{4}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mu_j \|u_j\|_{L^4}^4 - \frac{\beta}{2}\sum_{i<j} \int_\Omega u_i^2 u_j^2 \end{aligned}$$

is well defined for $u_1, \dots, u_n \in E$. It is well known that $J_\beta : E^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is of class C^2, and critical points of J_β are (weak) solutions of (1.3).

For $\beta \in (\overline{\beta}, \mu_1) \cup (\mu_n, \infty)$ let $m(\beta)$ be the Morse index of $u(\beta) = (\alpha_1(\beta)w, \dots, \alpha_n(\beta)w)$ as critical point of J_β. Recall the bifurcation parameters β_k from Proposition 3.5.

Lemma 4.1. *For $k \geq 2$ there holds*

$$m(\beta_k - \varepsilon) - m(\beta_k + \varepsilon) = (n-1)n_k \qquad \text{for } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ small.}$$

Proof. Consider the quadratic form on E^n given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\beta(\phi) &= \sum_{j=1}^n \int_\Omega (|\nabla\phi_j|^2 + a\phi_j^2) - \int_\Omega w^2\langle C(\beta)\phi,\phi\rangle \\ &= \|\phi\|_{E^n}^2 - \int_\Omega w^2\langle C(\beta)\phi,\phi\rangle \end{aligned}$$

where $C(\beta)$ is as in (3.1). Then $m(\beta)$ is precisely the index of Q_β. Let $E^n = V_{\beta_k}^+ \oplus V_{\beta_k}^0 \oplus V_{\beta_k}^-$ be the decomposition of E^n into the positive eigenspace $V_{\beta_k}^+$ of Q_{β_k}, the negative eigenspace $V_{\beta_k}^-$ of Q_{β_k}, and the kernel

$$V_{\beta_k}^0 = \left\{ \phi \in E^n : \phi_j \in V_k \text{ for } j = 1,\dots,n,\ \sum_{j=1}^n \gamma_j(\beta)\phi_j = 0 \right\}. \tag{4.1}$$

The derivative $Q'_\beta = \frac{\partial}{\partial\beta}Q_\beta$ of Q_β with respect to β is given by

$$Q'_\beta(\phi) = -\int_\Omega w^2\langle C'(\beta)\phi,\phi\rangle.$$

Recall that $C(\beta)$ is a smooth function of β. Now we have

$$Q_\beta = Q_{\beta_k} + (\beta-\beta_k)Q'_{\beta_k} + o(|\beta-\beta_k|) \text{ as } \beta \to \beta_k.$$

This implies that $Q_\beta > 0$ on $V_{\beta_k}^+$ and $Q_\beta < 0$ on $V_{\beta_k}^-$, if β is close to β_k. Thus the lemma follows if Q'_{β_k} is positive on $V_{\beta_k}^0$. In order to prove this let $T(\beta) \in SO(n)$ be as in 3.3, that is, T depends smoothly on β, and satisfies

$$T(\beta)^{-1}C(\beta)T(\beta) = \operatorname{diag}(3, f(\beta),\dots,f(\beta)) =: C_T(\beta).$$

It follows that $C(\beta)T(\beta) = T(\beta)C_T(\beta)$, hence

$$C'(\beta) = T'(\beta)C_T(\beta)T(\beta)^{-1} + T(\beta)C'_T(\beta)T(\beta)^{-1} - C(\beta)T'(\beta)T(\beta)^{-1}$$

For an eigenvector $u \in b_1(\beta)^\perp \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ of $C(\beta)$ corresponding to the eigenvalue $f(\beta)$ we compute

$$T'(\beta)C_T(\beta)T(\beta)^{-1}u = f(\beta)T'(\beta)T(\beta)^{-1}u,$$

$$T(\beta)C'_T(\beta)T(\beta)^{-1}u = f'(\beta)u,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\langle C(\beta)T'(\beta)T(\beta)^{-1}u, u\rangle &= \langle T'(\beta)T(\beta)^{-1}u, C(\beta)u\rangle \\ &= f(\beta)\langle T'(\beta)T(\beta)^{-1}u, u\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\langle C'(\beta)u, u\rangle = f'(\beta)|u|^2.$$

According to Proposition 3.5 a function $\phi \in V^0_{\beta_k}$ satisfies

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \gamma_j(\beta_k)\phi_j = 0, \text{ i. e. } \phi(x) \in b_1(\beta_k)^{\perp} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \text{ for every } x \in \Omega.$$

Here we used Proposition 3.5 b). Consequently, for $\phi \in V^0_{\beta_k}$ we have

$$Q'_{\beta_k}(\phi) = -\int_{\Omega} w^2\langle C'(\beta_k)\phi, \phi\rangle = -f'(\beta_k)\int_{\Omega} |\phi|^2 w^2 > 0$$

because $f'(\beta_k) < 0$ by Remark 3.2. Therefore Q'_{β_k} is positive definite on $V^0_{\beta_k}$, as required. ☐

Theorem 4.2. *For every $k \geq 2$, the point $(\beta, u(\beta)) \in \mathcal{T}_w$ is a bifurcation point of solutions of* (1.3)*.*

Proof. We can apply a classical bifurcation theorem of Krasnoselski [9] in the version of [16, Theorem 8.9]. The argument proceeds as in [4, pp. 354-355]. Alternatively one can use [3]. Both arguments yield that the bifurcating solutions are actually positive. ☐

Remark 4.3. *a) If $(n-1)n_k$ is odd then there exists a connected set $\mathcal{S}_k \subset \mathbb{R}\times E^n\setminus\mathcal{T}_w$ of solutions (β, u) of* (1.3) *such that $(\beta_k, u(\beta_k)) \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}_k$. This can be proved using degree theory in the spirit of Rabinowitz' global bifurcation theorem. Whether $\mathcal{S}_k$ is unbounded in the β-direction, or in the E^n-direction, or whether it returns to $\mathcal{T}_w$ is unclear in general.*

b) The case $n = 2$ has been treated in [4]. Clearly, if n is odd degree theoretic methods do not apply. On the other hand, one may hope for an $(n-1)n_k$-dimensional manifold of bifurcating solutions, or multiple bifurcating branches. In many cases, a high dimensional kernel is not generic but forced by some symmetry. In the next section we present some hidden symmetry, which is not inherent to the full functional, but to a special type of solutions. In this way we obtain multiple bifurcating branches.

5 Branches of partially locked solutions

In this section we investigate partially locked solutions of (1.3), i. e. solutions (β, u) where u_i/u_j is constant for some, but not all $i \neq j$. If u_i/u_j is constant we say that u_i and u_j are locked.

Lemma 5.1. *If* (β, u) *solves* (1.3) *and* u_i, u_j *are locked then*

$$u_j = \left(\frac{\mu_i - \beta}{\mu_j - \beta}\right)^{1/2} u_i = \frac{\gamma_j(\beta)}{\gamma_i(\beta)}\, u_i \ .$$

Proof. We set $u_j = \gamma u_i$ for some $\gamma > 0$. Then the equations (1.3) for u_i and u_j lead to

$$-\Delta u_i + a u_i = (\mu_i + \beta\gamma^2) u_i^3 + \beta \sum_{k \neq i,j} u_k^2 u_i$$

and, respectively, to

$$-\Delta u_i + a u_i = (\mu_j \gamma^2 + \beta) u_i^3 + \beta \sum_{k \neq i,j}^{n} u_k^2 u_i$$

It follows that

$$\gamma = \left(\frac{\mu_i - \beta}{\mu_j - \beta}\right)^{1/2} = \frac{\gamma_j(\beta)}{\gamma_i(\beta)}.$$

□

The next result reveals some hidden symmetry in the problem which will allow a dimension reduction argument below. It is simple to prove but has not been observed before.

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose* (β, u) *solves* (1.3) *for some* $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, *and suppose*

$$u_j = \left(\frac{\mu_i - \beta}{\mu_j - \beta}\right)^{1/2} u_i = \frac{\gamma_j(\beta)}{\gamma_i(\beta)}\, u_i \ .$$

Then (1.3) *also holds for* u_j.

Proof. We set $\gamma := \frac{\gamma_j(\beta)}{\gamma_i(\beta)}$, so $u_j = \gamma u_i$. Multiplying the equation for u_i

$$-\Delta u_i + a u_i = \mu_i \mu_i^3 + \beta \sum_{k \neq i} u_k^2 u_i = (\mu_i + \beta\gamma^2) u_i^3 + \beta \sum_{k \neq i,j} u_k^2 u_i$$

by γ yields

$$\begin{aligned}-\Delta u_j + au_j &= (\mu_i+\beta\gamma^2)\gamma u_i^3 + \beta\sum_{k\neq i,j} u_k^2u_j = (\mu_j\gamma^2+\beta)\gamma u_i^3 + \beta\sum_{k\neq i,j} u_k^2 u_j\\ &= \mu_j u_j^3 + \beta\sum_{k\neq j} u_k^2 u_j.\end{aligned}$$

This is equation (1.3) for u_j as claimed. $\square$

Let $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1,\dots,P_m\}$ be a partition of $\{1,\dots,n\}$, i. e. $\{1,\dots,n\} = P_1\cup\ldots\cup P_m$ is a disjoint union and $P_1,\dots,P_m \neq \emptyset$. We write $|\mathcal{P}| := m$ for the cardinality of $\mathcal{P}$. For $\beta<\mu_1$ we define

$$X_\beta^{\mathcal{P}} := \left\{u\in E^n \mid \forall k=1,\dots,m\ \forall\ i,j\in\mathcal{P}_k : u_j = \frac{\gamma_j(\beta)}{\gamma_i(\beta)}u_i\right\}.$$

A solution $u\in X_\beta^{\mathcal{P}}$ of (1.3) will be called $\mathcal{P}$-locked.

Proposition 5.3. *If $u\in X_\beta^{\mathcal{P}}$ is a critical point of $J_\beta|X_\beta^{\mathcal{P}}$ then u is a critical point of J_β, hence a solution of* (1.3).

Proof. We may assume $u_i\in P_i$ for $i=1,\dots,m$. That $u\in X_\beta^{\mathcal{P}}$ is a critical point of $J_\beta|X_\beta^{\mathcal{P}}$ is equivalent to $u_1,\dots,u_m$ being solutions of (1.3) with $u_j = \frac{\gamma_j(\beta)}{\gamma_i(\beta)}u_i$ $j\in P_i$, $i=1,\dots,m$. Lemma 5.2 implies that $u=(u_1,\dots,u_n)$ solves (1.3), hence u is a critical point of J_β. $\square$

One can now use Proposition 5.3 to find bifurcations of partially locked solutions in $X_\beta^{\mathcal{P}}$. We may assume that $i\in P_i$ for $i=1,\dots,m$. Define

$$i_\beta^{\mathcal{P}} : E^m \to X_\beta^{\mathcal{P}},\quad (u_1,\dots,u_m)\mapsto(u_1,\dots,u_n),$$

by

$$u_j = \frac{\gamma_j(\beta)}{\gamma_i(\beta)}u_i \quad \text{if } j\in P_i,\ i=1,\dots,m.$$

Let $\pi : E^n\to E^m$ be the projection onto the first m components, so that $\pi\circ i_\beta^{\mathcal{P}}$ is the identity on E^m for every $\beta<\mu_1$. Finally we define

$$J_\beta^{\mathcal{P}} := J\circ i_\beta^{\mathcal{P}} : E^m\to\mathbb{R}$$

for $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$. A critical point $u \in E^m$ of $J^{\mathcal{P}}_\beta$ yields a critical point $i^{\mathcal{P}}_\beta(u) \in X^{\mathcal{P}}_\beta$ of $J_\beta | X^{\mathcal{P}}_\beta$, hence a $\mathcal{P}$-locked solution of (1.3) as a consequence of Proposition 5.3. The branch

$$\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{P}}_w = \{(\beta, \pi u) : (\beta, u) \in \mathcal{T}_w\} = \{(\beta, u) : (\beta, i^{\mathcal{P}}_\beta(u)) \in \mathcal{T}_w\}$$

is a branch of critical points corresponding to the branch $\mathcal{T}_w$ of locked solutions.

Let $m^{\mathcal{P}}(\beta)$ be the Morse index of $\pi u(\beta) = (\alpha_1(\beta)w, \dots, \alpha_m(\beta)w)$ as critical point of $J^{\mathcal{P}}_\beta$. Bifurcation of $\mathcal{P}$-locked solutions occurs if $m^{\mathcal{P}}(\beta)$ changes.

Lemma 5.4. *For $k \geq 2$ there holds*

$$m^{\mathcal{P}}(\beta_k - \epsilon) - m^{\mathcal{P}}(\beta_k + \epsilon) = (|\mathcal{P}| - 1)n_k \qquad \text{for } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ small.}$$

Proof. This follows from Proposition 5.3 and Lemma 4.1 if we can show that

$$\dim(V^0_{\beta_k} \cap X^{\mathcal{P}}_{\beta_k}) = (|\mathcal{P}| - 1)n_k;$$

here $V^0_{\beta_k}$ is the kernel of the Hessian of J_{β_k} at $u(\beta_k)$ as in (4.1), and $n_k = \dim V_k$ as in (3.5); recall the description of $V^0_{\beta_k}$ in Proposition 3.5. For simplicity we write $\gamma_j = \gamma_j(\beta_k)$ below.

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi \in V^0_{\beta_k} \cap X^{\mathcal{P}}_{\beta_k} \quad &\iff \quad \phi_1, \dots, \phi_n \in V_k,\ \sum_{j=1}^n \gamma_j \phi_j = 0, \text{ and} \\
& \quad \phi_j = \frac{\gamma_j}{\gamma_i}\phi_i \text{ for } j \in P_i,\ i = 1, \dots, m = |\mathcal{P}| \\
&\iff \quad \phi_1, \dots, \phi_m \in V_k,\ \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\sum_{j \in P_i} \frac{\gamma_j^2}{\gamma_i} \right) \phi_i = 0, \text{ and} \\
& \quad \phi = i^{\mathcal{P}}_{\beta_k}(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m)
\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 5.5. *For every partition $\mathcal{P}$ of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ with $|\mathcal{P}| \geq 2$, and for every $k \geq 2$ the point $(\beta_k, u(\beta_k)) \in \mathcal{T}_w$ is a bifurcation point of $\mathcal{P}$-locked solutions of (1.3). It is a global bifurcation point of $\mathcal{P}$-locked solutions if $(|\mathcal{P}| - 1) \cdot n_k$ is odd.*

In the application of the Corollary 5.5 one has to be cautious because a $\mathcal{P}$-locked solution may also be $\mathcal{P}'$-locked for $\mathcal{P} \neq \mathcal{P}'$. This is the case if for any $P'_i \in \mathcal{P}'$ there exists a $P_j \in \mathcal{P}$ with $P'_i \subset P_j$. On the other hand, the bifurcating $\mathcal{P}$-locked solutions are different from the $\mathcal{P}'$-locked solutions if every solution which is both $\mathcal{P}$-locked and $\mathcal{P}'$-locked is automatically completely locked. Recall that the completely locked solutions are those in $\mathcal{T}_w$.

For a subset $A \subset \{1,\dots,n\}$ we set $A^c := \{1,\dots,n\} \setminus A$ and $\mathcal{P}_A := \{A, A^c\}$. Given two subsets $\emptyset \neq A, B \subsetneq \{1,\dots,n\}$ such that $A \neq B$ and $A^c \neq B$, a solution which is $\mathcal{P}_A$-locked and $\mathcal{P}_B$-locked is necessarily completely locked. We therefore obtain the following multiplicity result.

Corollary 5.6. *Suppose n_k is odd. For every subset $\emptyset \neq A \subsetneq \{1,\dots,n\}$ there exists a global branch $\mathcal{S}_k^A$ of $\mathcal{P}_A$-locked solutions of* (1.3) *bifurcating from $\mathcal{T}_w$ at $(\beta_k, u(\beta_k))$. The branches $\mathcal{S}_k^A$ and $\mathcal{S}_k^B$ are disjoint except when $A = B$ or $A = B^c$. In particular, there exist at least $2^{n-1} - 1$ such global branches which are different.*

Remark 5.7. *a) The corollary applies, for instance, if $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded interval, or if $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $2 \leq N \leq 3$, is radially symmetric and one looks for radially symmetric solutions, i. e. $G = O(N)$. Then problem* (2.1) *has a unique solution which is also nondegenerate in E. This has been proved in [12, 13, 19, 8], in the case of a ball, an annulus, and $\mathbb{R}^N$.*

b) The global features of the branches $\mathcal{S}_k^A$ are not known. In the radial setting and $n = 2$ it has been proved in [4] that the bifurcating branches $\mathcal{S}_k = \mathcal{S}_k^{\{1\}} \subset (-\infty, 0) \times E^2$ are bounded over bounded subsets of $(-\infty, 0)$, hence they cover all of $(-\infty, \beta_k)$. An extension of this result to $n > 2$ is work in progress.

Acknowledgment: The author thanks Pavol Quittner for discussions on the topic, and for the invitation and hospitality during a visit at the Comenius University in Bratislava in spring 2011.

References

[1] N. Akhmediev and A. Ankiewicz: *Partially coherent solitons on a finite background.* Phys. Rev. Lett., **82** (1999), 2661-2664.

[2] A. Ambrosetti and E. Colorado: *Standing waves of some coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations.* J. London Math. Soc. **75** (2007), 67-82.

[3] T. Bartsch and N. Dancer: *Poincaré-Hopf type formulas on convex sets of Banach spaces.* Top. Meth. Nonlin. Anal. **34** (2009), 213-229.

[4] T. Bartsch, N. Dancer, and Z.-Q. Wang, *A Liouville theorem, a-priori bounds, and bifurcating branches of positive solutions for a nonlinear elliptic system.* Calc. Var. **37** (2010), 345-361.

[5] T. Bartsch and Z.-Q. Wang: *Note on ground states of nonlinear Schrödinger systems.* J. Part. Diff. Equ. **19** (2006), 200-207.

[6] T. Bartsch, Z.-Q. Wang, and J. Wei: *Bound states for a coupled Schrödinger system.* J. fixed point theory appl. **2** (2007), 353-367.

[7] B. D. Esry, C. H. Greene, and J. P. Burke Jr., J. L. Bohn: *Hartree-Fock theory for double condensates.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** (1997), 3594.

[8] P. Felmer, S. Martnez, K. Tanaka: *Uniqueness of radially symmetric positive solutions for* $-\Delta u + u = u^p$ *in an annulus.* J. Diff. Equ. **245** (2008), 1198–1209.

[9] M. A. Krasnoselski: Topological Methods in the Theory of Nonlinear Integral Equations. Pergamon Press, New York (1964).

[10] T.-C. Lin and J. Wei: *Ground state of* N *coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations in* $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \leq 3$. Comm. Math. Phys. **255** (2005), 629-653. Erratum: Comm. Math. Phys. **277** (2008), 573-576.

[11] L.A. Maia, E. Montefusco, B. Pellacci: *Positive solutions for a weakly coupled nonlinear Schrödinger system.* J. Diff. Eq. **229** (2006),743-767.

[12] W.-M. Ni, I. Takagi: *On the shape of least-energy solutions to a semilinear Neumann problem.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **44** (1991), 819–851.

[13] W.-M. Ni, J. Wei: *On the location and profile of spike-layer solutions to singularly perturbed semilinear Dirichlet problems.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **48** (1995), 731–768.

[14] B. Noris, H. Tavares, S. Terracini, G. Verzini: *Uniform Hölder bounds for nonlinear Schrödinger systems with strong competition.* Preprint.

[15] B. Malomed: *Multi-component Bose-Einstein condensates: Theory.* In: P.G. Kevrekidis, D.J. Frantzeskakis, R. Carretero-Gonzalez (Eds.), Emergent Nonlinear Phenomena in Bose-Einstein Condensation, Springer-Verlag, Berlin 2008, 287-305.

[16] J. Mawhin and M. Willem: Critical Point Theory and Hamiltonian Systems. Springer-Verlag, New York (1989).

[17] A. Pomponio: *Coupled nonlinear Schrdinger systems with potentials.* J. Diff. Eq. **227** (2006), 258-281.

[18] B. Sirakov: *Least energy solitary waves for a system of nonlinear Schrdinger equations in* $\mathbb{R}^n$. Comm. Math. Phys. **271** (2007), 199-221.

[19] M. Tang: *Uniqueness of positive radial solutions for* $\Delta u - u + u^p = 0$ *on an annulus.* J. Diff. Equ. **189** (2003), 148–160.

[20] J. Wei and T. Weth: *Nonradial symmetric bound states for a system of two coupled Schrödinger equations.* Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl. **18** (2007), 279-293.

[21] J. Wei and T. Weth: *Radial solutions and phase separation in a system of two coupled Schrödinger equations.* Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. **190** (2008), 83-106.

Address of the author:

Thomas Bartsch
Mathematisches Institut
University of Giessen
Arndtstr. 2
35392 Giessen
Germany
Thomas.Bartsch@math.uni-giessen.de